From: Jay Field
To: John Toll

Cc: Nancy Musgrove; Lucinda Tear; Corinne Severn; Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Robert Neely; Corinne

Severn

**Subject:** Re: LWG hit classification changes

**Date:** 11/18/2010 09:07 PM

```
Hi John, thanks for checking.

Jay

On 11/18/2010 6:01 PM, John Toll wrote:

> Hi Jay, Lucinda's looked into this and agrees with you that the mistake was at our end. We used 8 replicates with zero as the effect value for biomass for Labrep = 1. So your CHG hit classification for G643 is correct. We'll send you the final hit classification table tomorrow.

John

> ----Original Message----

> From: Jay Field [mailto:Jay.Field@noaa.gov]

> Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2010 9:26 AM

> To: Nancy Musgrove

Cc: John Toll; Burt Shepard; Eric Blischke; Robert Neely

> Subject: LWG hit classification changes

> Nancy,

> Wareviewed the changes in hit classifications changes identified by LWG and have one question about the "NOAA QC error" for Chironomus biomass results for station G643. the following text is from our notes on the bloassay results for Phase 3 that are included in our database:

> "For StationID = G643 (File 48), Labrep = 1, the initial number of

> organisms was 15. This replicate was not used for the calculations.

Therefore, the lab (and this database) used n=7 for average effect

> values for survival,

> biomass and growth calculations. With respect to calculating

> statistical significance, Windward used 7 replicates for the survival endpoint, but used 8 replicates with zero as the effect value for

> biomass for Labrep = 1. "

> If you include rep 1 and treat as 0 survival, then the survival test

> value should be 73.75 and test/ctrl 84.29. Are those the values for survival that you used?

> As we discussed at the meeting on 11/4, it would be very helpful if LWG

> provided a table with results for each endpoint that included the following information: test values, test/ctrl, ctrl, statistical

> significance, and toxicity (hit) level.

> thanks,

> Jay
```